EXHIBIT C

Trial Transcript Day 3 Excerpts

	Emerson Creek Pottery, Inc. v. Emerson Creek Events, Inc., 6:20cv54, 2/24/2022	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	
2	LYNCH	BURG DIVISION
3	***************	
4	EMERSON CREEK POTTERY, INC.	FEBRUARY 24, 2022, 9:37 A.M.
5	Plaintiff,	JURY TRIAL, DAY 3
6	vs.	
7	EMERSON CREEK EVENTS, INC.,	Before:
8	ET AL.,	HONORABLE NORMAN K. MOON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	Defendants.	WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
9	**************************************	
10		
11	For the Plaintiff:	HENRY IRVING WILLETT, III, ESQUIRE Christian and Barton, LLP
12		909 East Main Street, Suite 1200 Richmond, VA 23219
13		
14		GARFIELD BERNARD GOODRUM, ESQUIRE Garfield Goodrum, Design Law 90 Canal Street, 4th Floor
15		Boston, MA 02114
16	For the Defendants:	KENNETH S. MCLAUGHLIN, JR., ESQUIRE Law Offices of McLaughlin &
17		Associates, P.C. 1 E. Benton Street, Suite 301
18		Aurora, IL 60505
19		LAWRENCE E. LAUBSCHER, JR., ESQUIRE Laubscher & Laubscher, PC
20		1160 Spa Road, Suite 2B Annapolis, MD 21403
21		
22	Court Reporter: Lisa M. Blair, RPR, RMR, CRR, FOCR 255 West Main Street, Suite 304 Charlottesville, Virginia 22902 434.296.9284	
23		
24	[19] 하나 아니라 있는데 다시다. [19] 12[19] 보고 다시 그리고 그는데 다른데 다	
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY; TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.	

Belisle - Direct

"pottery and tearoom," followed by "pottery and tearoom wedding 1 venues." 2 3 To be really clear about this, these aren't the results. This is what what's auto filling at this point. This is what 4 you're seeing as you type it in in real time, "wedding" is the 5 first thing that comes up, then nothing, then "pottery," then 6 7 "pottery and tearoom," then "pottery and tearoom wedding venues"? 8 9 Just like all algorithmic understandings for search, Pinterest's algorithm is determining based on the keyword terms 10 this user typed in, that this is the content that's going to be 11 most relevant to them on the platform before they even click 13 return. I'm going to switch gears a little bit and talk for a 14 second about -- well, let me ask you this. We don't have a 15 slide of this. We've seen something presented on Ms. Demiduk on LinkedIn. Does LinkedIn factor into searching or consumers 17 looking at LinkedIn, or is that just a business thing? 18 19 No, it's 100 percent -- it plays into reputation because 20 it also can populate on Google. 21 And consumers use LinkedIn as well as businesses? 22 Correct. Now, let's talk for a second about, you talked about 23 Google. So we've sort of done what I call the social media 24

side of this. Let's talk about the search side of this.

Belisle - Direct

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

did you determine from your analysis on the search side? We determined that there has been so much activity on the part of -- there's been so much activity relative to the search term "Emerson Creek" that there is significant -- there's been a significant presence in search engine results that have resulted in muddying the waters. There's significant confusion, just by the algorithms, if not then translates to users, for the fact that there is not one entity that shows up for the short tail search term, right? So here's -- we're pulling up the results now. This is just on the next page. The search is the same search, "Emerson Creek"? Yep, you search "Emerson Creek" in Google, you get these results. If you search a little further -- this was done on a mobile phone so it's a little crunched. Let me ask you this: As you're performing this search on Google, does it matter where you are? A Yes, it does. There are over 200 factors in Google's algorithm. So just by solving for one particular factor doesn't necessarily heavily influence the results. There's a definite hierarchy to all those factors. But there's over 200 factors. One of those factors is your geography. Hence, anyone hops on their phone or computer, wherever they're based, Google recognizes that as an IP address and recognizes your location and might serve you local results based on what you're searching for.

Emerson Creek Pottery, Inc. v. Emerson Creek Events, Inc., 6:20cv54, 2/24/2022 1 gentlemen of the jury, we'll take a lunch recess now and I'll ask you to come back at 1:45. 2 (Jury out, 12:40 p.m.) 3 4 (Recess.) 5 THE COURT: Before the jury comes back, have you finished with your witnesses? 6 7 MR. WILLETT: Yes, Your Honor. We've finished our witnesses. We have a couple things we were going to stipulate 8 to for the record and then there's one other issue. There's a witness, Mr. Wehrli, who we are not going to call in our case 10 in chief. He may be called by the defendants, but we may end 11 12 up having to take him out of order at some point. We'll work 13 around that just so he can be on Zoom and we don't slow down the process. But we are done with our witness presentation. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WILLETT: Do you want us to take that up -- there 16 are a few exhibits I need to run through with Carmen, that 17 18 those have been stipulated to that those can be admitted. 19 other thing we would ask about, there are some discovery 20 designations, things we had designated 30 days out that we 21 wanted to have part of the record. 22 THE COURT: Anything else -- you want to show it to the jury, right? 23 24 MR. WILLETT: Yes. Yes. 25 MR. LAUBSCHER: Your Honor, since the plaintiffs have Emerson Creek Pottery, Inc. v. Emerson Creek Events, Inc., 6:20cv54, 2/24/2022

now rested their case, we would like to file a motion for a directed verdict.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LAUBSCHER: So it would be on the issues of breach of contract, we don't think they've met their burden of proof with regard to the existence of a contract. We certainly don't think they've met their burden of proof that there was a license agreement that was agreed to by the parties. So on these breach of contract and the licensing claims, we think that judgment should be in our favor.

Moreover, as a result of Mr. Leavitt's testimony, we think that the acquiescence that we have asserted as a defense has been established. And as you know, that's an equity relief which you can grant without regard to the jury.

So again, we don't think there's been proof of breach of contract. We don't think that there has been -- we think there's acquiescence. And quite honestly, on the trademark infringement claim, we don't think they've met their burden on that as well.

THE COURT: All right. If you'll respond.

MR. WILLETT: In response, Judge, we have met our burden on all of those issues. With respect to breach of contract, we've got the testimony of Mr. Leavitt as to the handshake agreement that was reached between the parties. As the Court knows, that would qualify both for the contract as

Emerson Creek Pottery, Inc. v. Emerson Creek Events, Inc., 6:20cv54, 2/24/2022

well as for the license.

We've also argued that in the event it was determined that there was not a contract, that there is an implied license as well. So we have met our brief on that. We've also met --well, we've established that there was a license. They were holdover licensees. It would be their burden to show acquiescence. But we've shown there was the necessary control exerted, and we believe we've met all elements of our affirmative case, Your Honor. And happy to address any specific questions the Court may have.

THE COURT: I'm going to let the case go forward and deny the motion at this time. These are close issues, but I'm going to let it go forward and we'll revisit it after the verdict.

(Jury in, 1:51 p.m.)

THE COURT: Have a seat. We'll proceed.

MR. WILLETT: And may it please the Court, Henry Willett again on behalf of the plaintiff. Prior to concluding plaintiff's presentation of evidence, I'd just like to pull up a few exhibits so that they can be admitted. They have been stipulated to by defendants. Those are going to be -- actually, we'll start with the exhibits, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Do them one at a time.

The first one, Carmen, is going to be Exhibit 4 that we move to be admitted. Again, I'm not going to go through all

C. Demiduk - Cross

CERTIFICATE

I, Lisa M. Blair, RMR/CRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

/s/ Lisa M. Blair Date: March 9, 2022